PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

REC'D 0 9 AUG 2005

PCT WIPO

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference	FOR FURTHER ACTION	s	ee Form PCT/IPEA/416
6.0869 WO		ath/mar)	Priority date (day/month/year)
nternational application No.	International filing date (day/mo	пилуеат)	09.09.2003
CT/B2004/002815	30.08.2004		
Batant Classification (PC) or national classification and IPC		
nternational Patent Classification (•		
104L29/06			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Applicant			
AVALTO SA At al			
	" to a commination report	established by this	s International Preliminary Examining 6.
1. This report is the internat	tional preliminary examination report, and transmitted to the applicant account to the applicant account to the second se	ording to Article 36	5.
Authority under Article 35	of a total of 5 sheets, including this co	over sheet.	
This report is also accom	npanied by ANNEXES, comprising:	a total of sheets, a	as follows:
a. 🔲 sent to the applic	npanied by ANNEXES, comprising and and to the International Bureau) a	which have been a	amended and are the basis of this report see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the
☐ sheets of the	description, claims and/or drawings of a containing rectifications authorized	by this Authority (s	mended and are the basis of this lopest see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the
☐ sheets which	h supersede earlier sheets, but which	this Authority cons	siders contain an amendment that goes licated in item 4 of Box No. I and the
b. [] (sent to the Inter	mational Bureau only) a total of company and or tables related thereto, in comp	puter readable form	n only, as indicated in the Supplemental eliminations).
sequence issuing Box Relating to	g and/or tables related thereto, in comp Sequence Listing (see Section 802 of	I tue Youngistank	5 (nouse serve)
4. This report contains inc	dications relating to the following item	is:	
	s of the opinion		
			onplicability
☐ Box No. II Prior	rity -establishment of opinion with regard	to novelty, inventi	ve step and industrial applicability
☐ Box No. III Non	k of unity of invention		ا ماسفوریاد در ا
☐ Box No. IV Lack	k of unity of invention asoned statement under Article 35(2)	with regard to nove	elty, inventive step or industrial
☑ Box No. V Rea	asoned statement under Article 35(2) Dicability; citations and explanations s	upporting such sta	itemeni
m - N- VI Cor	tain documents cited		
	defects in the international application	cation	
☐ Box No. VII Cer	rtain observations on the international	l application	
	ICAIN COOK		
Box No. VIII Go.			of this report
	and	Date of completion	Of and repe
Date of submission of the dem	nand	Date of completion	Of the self-self-self-self-self-self-self-self-
Date of submission of the dem	nand	Date of completion of the comp	0. a.i.
	nand	08.08.2005	
Date of submission of the den			and the first Palacean.
Date of submission of the dent 30.03.2005 Name and mailing address of	f the international rity:	08.08.2005	- Salarina Pelanian
Date of submission of the dem 30.03.2005 Name and malling address of preliminary examining author European Pate	f the international rity: ent Office	08.08.2005	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Date of submission of the dem 30.03.2005 Name and malling address of preliminary examining author European Pate	f the international rity: ent Office ich 399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d	08.08.2005 Authorized Officer	of photoses Principles

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No. PCT/IB2004/002815

_	Box No. I Basis of the report	in which it was	
1.	. With regard to the language, this report is based on the international application in the language in which		
	high ie the landilade Ol d us	lations from the original language into the following language, anslation furnished for the purposes of:	
	☐ international search (under publication of the internation of the internation of the international features and the international features are the international features and the international features are the inter	er Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)) ional application (under Rule 12.4) examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)	
 international preliminary examination (ancestor) With regard to the elements* of the international application, this report is based have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Anareport as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report): 		the international application, this report is based on (replacement sheets which	
	Description, Pages	as originally filed	
	1-10	as onginally med	
	Claims, Numbers		
	1-5	as originally filed	
	Drawings, Sheets	·	
	1/2-2/2	as originally filed	
	☐ a sequence listing and/or a	ny related table(s) - see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing	
	3. The amendments have res	sulted in the cancellation of:	
	☐ the description, pages☐ the claims, Nos.	·	
	☐ the drawings, sheets/fig	gs pagituh	
	☐ the sequence listing (s)☐ any table(s) related to	sequence listing (specify).	
	4. This report has been estated had not been made, since the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2)	blished as if (some of) the amendments annexed to this report and listed below y have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in th (c)).	
	☐ the description, pages☐ the claims, Nos.		
	The drawings, sheets/fi	igs specify):	
	☐ the sequence listing (s☐ any table(s) related to	sequence name toposity.	
	* If item 4 applies,	some or all of these sheets may be marked "superseded."	

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No. PCT/B2004/002815

1. 18

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims No: Claims 1-5

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

1-5 No: Claims

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-5

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7):

see separate sheet

PCT/IB2004/002815

Cited documents

٠., *

The following documents are mentioned for the first time in this written opinion; the numbering will be adhered to in the rest of the procedure:

- D1: EP-A-1 156 694 (MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC CORP) 21 November 2001 (2001-11-
- D2: WO 99/64996 A (LANDIS & GYR COMMUNICATIONS S ;CAMBOIS ETIENNE (FR)) 16 December 1999 (1999-12-16)

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

- The subject matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of 1. Article 33(3) PCT.
 - Document D1 discloses, according to most of the features of claim 1, an authentication method in a system including a first entity (figure 16, sender) and a second entity (figure 16, receiver) mutually communication by way of a network (figure 16, radio network) both storing the same secret key (figure 16, IK), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving by said first entity a message authentication code (column 14, lines 19-24 and 32-34);

- computing by said first entity an expected code (column 14, lines 34,35); comparing said message authentication code received and said expected code (column 14, lines 35-37)
- aborting authentication if the message authentication code received and the expected code do not match (column 14, lines 44-45)
- The subject-matter of claim 1 differs from this disclosure of D1 only in that 2. the method has an additional step of: updating in said first entity a failure counter every time the message authentication code received and the expected code do not match.
- The difference relates to the problem of detecting consecutive attacks. 3.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

16.00

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/002815

The problem is rendered obvious by D1 which mentions that the connection has to be disconnected in case of consecutive attacks (column 14, lines 44-45).

It is then a straightforward measure to count these attacks in order to figure out if a certain number of failed attempts occurred in a predetermined period. Using counters for this purpose is also generally known in the art, see for example D2 page 7.

The person skilled in the art faced with the above mentioned problem would therefore add to the method described in D1 the step of updating a counter to keep track of the number of failed authentication attempts thus obtaining the method of claim 1.

- 2. The inventive step objection also applies to claim 5, which corresponds to claim 1.
- 3. The additional features of the dependent claims do not add anything inventive because they are either directly known or derivable from the above mentioned D1 (detecting duplicated packets) or presents standard practice (checking the number of failed attempts before starting the procedure).